

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 11-CR-20777-DT

ANTHONY VAN,

Defendant.

**ORDER STRIKING DEFENDANT’S “MOTION TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF SUBJECT
MATTER JURISDICTION”**

Defendant submits a self-written and self-signed “Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction.” Defendant, however, enjoys representation by counsel. A party may chose to represent himself or to appear through an attorney, but a party may not maintain a “hybrid” representation, by which he proceeds both through himself and through counsel. *See, e.g., United States v. Olson*, 576 F.2d 1267, 1269-70 (8th Cir. 1978); *United States v. Daniels*, 572 F.2d 535, 540 (5th Cir. 1978); *Ennis v. LeFevre*, 560 F.2d 1072, 1075 (2nd Cir. 1977); *United States v. Williams*, 534 F.2d 119, 123 (8th Cir. 1976); *United States v. Hill*, 526 F.2d 1019, 1024-25 (10th Cir. 1975); *Move Org. v. City of Phila.*, 89 F.R.D. 521, 523 n.1 (E.D.Pa.1981); *United States ex rel. Snyder v. Mack*, 372 F.Supp. 1077, 1078-79 (E.D.Pa.1974). In other words, so long as Defendant’s counsel represents Defendant, only Defendant’s counsel may submit a paper. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Defendant's "Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction" [Dkt. # 28] is STRICKEN.

s/Robert H. Cleland
ROBERT H. CLELAND
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: September 12, 2012

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was mailed to counsel of record on this date, September 12, 2012, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/Lisa Wagner
Case Manager and Deputy Clerk
(313) 234-5522